DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 071 CS 204 463

AUTHOR Allen, Charles; And Others
TITLE Reconciling the Differences: Partnerships in Teacher Preparation Programs.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 14p.; Report prepared at the University of Pittsburgh

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Measurement Instruments; *Rating Scales; Schools of Education; Student Teaching; *Teacher Education; Teacher Educator Education

ABSTRACT

Based on the belief that effective teacher preparation programs exist only when cooperation between participating institutions is a reality, an instrument was designed to facilitate communication and to enable participants in a cooperative teacher education program to become more aware of their own values and attitudes toward specific issues which could affect the program. The instrument requires that participants rate levels of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements designed to determine attitudes towards cooperative efforts. It determines three attitudes: a totally public school stance which places little or no value on university input, a totally university-oriented position which recognizes little of value in public school input, and an attitude which reflects an awareness and acceptance of the need for cooperation and joint decision making. Among the suggested uses for the instrument are administering it as an introductory activity in an inservice program for districts involved in a cooperative venture to develop a keener awareness of the issues and the beliefs of participants, using it as a means of gathering information which would enable universities to anticipate problems which could develop when instituting a cooperative field-based program, and using it as a means of developing an awareness of the problems in bridging the gap between theory and practice. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161071

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Reconciling the Differences:

Partnerships in Teacher Preparation Programs

Submitted by

Dr. Charles Allen

Dr. Rita Bean

Dr. Jean Winsand

University of Pittsburgh
School of Education
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles Allen; Rita Bean; Jean Winsand

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

(Submitted to ERIC Documents)
1973

CS201463

Reconciling the Differences: Partnerships in Teacher Preparation Programs

by

Charles Allen
Rita Bean
Jean Winsand

University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA

Arguments about the responsibility for the preparation and continuous development of teachers have raged for years as universities or colleges and public schools have each demanded a strengthened role in the process. Currently, the issue is becoming even more complex as teachers' organizations and community agencies press for more control. Many issues, such as the selection and grading of students, the control of curriculum, and course content continue to be raised with each institution demanding a voice in resolving these and other issues. However, effective teacher preparation programs exist only when cooperation between participating institutions is a reality. Indeed, although many institutions have attempted "cooperative programs," these endeavors have had limited impact because of unresolved conflict between the participants.

The support for more broadly based and jointly developed teacher preparation programs can be found in the writings of teacher educators such as Austin (1961), Smith (1969), Olson, et al. (1971), and Housam, (1976). These writers suggest that teacher preparation programs become more field oriented, and that higher education and basic education institutions develop interactions which will facilitate cooperative planning and decision-making. There is strong support for involving public school faculties in instruction, including the teaching of courses. At the same time, university and college faculty are exhorted to move from the campus to the public school environment where they might provide input not only into the education experiences of the teacher trainees but also into the decision-making processes affecting the local schools.

The cooperation process is not an easy one. Strong biases and assumptions, existing in both public schools and universities, have hampered the establishment of comfortable cooperative efforts. The problems inherent in these partnership attempts are clearly stated by Haberman (1971):

> As if working in mutually exclusive organizations and being reinforced by different reward systems were not enough, personality and value differences are quite common. Public school people regard college people as too theoretical and more concerned with analysis than solutions, not capable of working within legal structures, incapable of hard work during regularly scheduled business hours. College people perceive public school people as too conservative in accepting research or responding to great social problems... In truth, both groups are experts in maintaining their own organizations and espousing radical reforms in the other. (p. 134).

Nevertheless, in most states the efforts to establish working relationships between Schools of Education and school districts have proceeded for the past several years.

Indeed, even as educators look to the future in education, they continue to predict the existence of and need for jointly developed teacher preparation programs. In a study done in Canada (Clarke and Coutts, 1971), forty panelists comprised of chief administrative officers in the English-language teacher education institutes, submitted and reacted to statements about the future of teacher education. Statements from the panelists were analyzed and categorized as to consensus and probable date of occurrence. All three of the following statements were placed into the "considerable consensus" category (70-79 per cent of the panelists agreed on the statements):

> Teacher and teachers' organizations will share control of teacher education about equally with teacher education institutions in determining the overall goals of teacher education (by 1980).
>
> The majority of professors of education will spend as much time in the field with children and with teachers as they do in the University (by 1985).
>
> Teacher education will be centered around an extended internship (by 1985). (p. 513).

In a report compiled by the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Howsam, et al., 1976), the following two recommendations specifically support cooperative efforts in teacher development:

> That the establishment of some teacher education centers be located away from the campus, employing well-prepared, professional supervisors who retain continuing teaching responsibilities with a local school system and serve as adjunct or part-time members of one or more college faculties. (p. 94).
>
> That all parties devise mechanisms where communities, local education agencies, and institutions of higher education work together to reconcile their varying perceptions of what education should be. Responsible, open collaboration among all constituencies must occur in order to build responsive, pluralistic programs. (p. 97).

Because of the strong support for jointly based programs now and in the future, there is a need for processes which will enable participating institutions to work together in a partnership relationship.

These writers have been involved in developing various kinds of cooperative relationships between local public schools and several programs in the School of Education, University of Pittsburgh. During each experience, one of the major problems evidenced has been that of cooperative decision making: a problem which has been recognized in most ventures of this type. Indeed, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (1974), noting a trend throughout European and American countries toward participatory pedagogy and increased emphasis on developing planning and decision-making skills of teachers, discusses the problem of involving teachers in the formulation of the framework of the educational system. They suggest that a concerted effort be made to develop these decision-making skills.

Because of our interest and efforts in developing cooperative programs, and our concerns about the difficulty that participants experience in working as partners in the decision-making process, these authors decided to develop an instrument which would provide a process by which persons involved in a cooperative venture could become aware of some of the potential areas of conflict and difference. The instrument contained in this article is to be used to facilitate communication and to enable participants in a cooperative teacher education program to become more aware of their own values and attitudes towards specific issues which could affect the venture.

The attitude survey requires that participants rate levels of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements which are designed to determine attitudes towards cooperative efforts in educating teachers. The scale is designed to determine three attitudes ranging from (1) a totally public school stance which places little or no value on university input, to (2) a totally university-oriented position which recognizes little of value in public school input, to (3) the attitude which reflects an awareness and acceptance of the need for cooperation and joint decision-making.

Items in the scale were developed by the authors based on experiences and efforts in creating and implementing field-based programs and comments offered by pre-service teachers in evaluating their experiences in these programs. The instrument was administered to 96 undergraduates, graduates, and university personnel of the University of Pittsburgh, and various items were revised and/or eliminated based on feedback from these groups. Item/category correlations were run, and it was found that items did correlate with the total score of the category in which they fell. Indeed, all correlations of individual items with their category totals were significant at the .01 level. Although it was found that both graduate and undergraduate students were aware of and sensitive to the need for cooperation, graduate students (teachers in the field) scored significantly higher than did undergraduates in the category which reflected an awareness and concern for the issues underlying effective cooperation.

Recommendations for Use of Scale

The potential uses of the attitude scale are many and varied. The following ideas are presented only as a stimulus for the reader whose own experience, professional position, and values will suggest additional uses.

1. The instrument could be used in supervision classes to determine how potential supervisors, who have a major portion of the responsibility for working with teachers, administrators, and student teachers, feel toward the essential relationships in a potentially successful co-operative effort.
2. This instrument could be administered as an introductory activity in an inservice program for districts involved in a cooperative venture to develop a keener sense of awareness of the issues, as well as to explore the beliefs of the participants.
3. The university could use information gathered by such an instrument to anticipate problems which could develop when instituting a cooperative field-based program. If key personnel are required to complete this instrument and the results are studied carefully, specific areas of conflict existing in a particular school district may be identified. Administration and analysis of this instrument might be only the beginning of a district-wide study of attitudes which could affect a variety of new programs and other types of cooperative efforts of a school district. It may even be feasible to use the results to help identify persons suitable for leadership roles. For example, persons whose attitudes are compatible with beliefs underlying such ideas as "traditional versus open" education and/or "back to basics" could be identified.

4. The instrument could be used to get an idea about the levels of awareness among a given group of classroom teachers (especially cooperating teachers) who may be required to help resolve problems which are evident in dealing with conflicts such as those revealed in items 14 and 24. Item 14 addresses the problem of grading student teachers and explores the question of whose responsibility this should be--the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor. Item 24 deals with the location, context and instructional input in general methods courses for students in training. These authors think that most persons involved in such cooperative efforts would agree that resolving such issues requires a certain level of awareness and a high degree of flexibility.
5. Finally, the instrument would be useful for organizations other than school districts or universities. For example, at the state level this instrument could be helpful for planning how to train and place personnel who will be responsible for developing and implementing competency-based, role-based or other types of program conceptualizations. It should also develop a better awareness of the issues and problems in bridging the gap between theory and practice.

Cooperation or Conflict

(A Survey of Attitude Towards Field-based Instruction)

Introduction: One way of facilitating program development and staff development is to develop field-based programs which provide opportunities to coordinate pre-service and in service activities. However, many opinions exist regarding the value and benefits of such programs. The items below express some opinions and ask some questions regarding the value and benefits of field-based programs.

Directions: Read each item carefully and give it a rating of 1, 2, 3, or 4 to indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with that item.

Code:

4 - Strongly Agree
3 - Somewhat Agree
2 - Somewhat Disagree
1 - Strongly Disagree

	4	3	2	1
1. Involvement of the college or university educator in cooperative efforts should be applicable towards promotion and tenure (the reward system) as is research and publication.				
2. Programs which accompany University-School Community partnerships tend only to benefit the university students by providing an opportunity for them to "practice" with children.				
3. The pupils in a field site school should be the primary consideration of all involved personnel.				
4. The university student should be the one to make the decisions regarding such things as assignments to schools, selection of cooperating teachers and grade levels and whether or not the student will change classrooms at mid-term. If students have an opportunity to observe in the various schools, they will have the knowledges and experiences necessary to make these decisions.				
5. A teacher cannot give fullest attention to her class while supervising a student teacher.				
6. The basic responsibility for student teaching is in the local district and the higher education institution should pay for those services.				

		4	3	2	1
7.	Student teachers who have trouble should be moved out of the situation immediately and returned to the teacher education institution.				
8.	The pre-service teacher should be given the responsibility for planning and teaching the main (core) courses in the school curriculum during the first weeks of the term rather than waiting until the end. This helps the student teacher to become more than just a helper in the classroom and will cause children in the classroom to have more respect for him/her. Actually a visitor to the classroom after a few weeks should not be able to tell the student teacher from the teacher.				
9.	Children should not be exposed to a lesson which has been prepared by a "student of teaching" until that lesson has been assessed and tried out in a simulated situation.				
10.	University sponsored programs have as a major goal the provision of a "proving grounds" for research and experimentation with children, who are nothing more than guinea pigs or white rats (usually black ones) for university professors and students.				
11.	Field site work is extremely time and energy consuming for the university educator and should be considered as such in workload assignments.				
12.	Part of the role of the university educator is to help determine the <u>needs</u> of the field site in which he or she works and to assist in the planning of programs based on those needs.				
13.	Because student teachers provide opportunities for increased individualization of instruction, the school program should become more effective.				
14.	The university supervisor should have final responsibility for grades because the institution is the certifying agent.				
15.	The university student should be allowed to assign grades to students with whom he or she works just as a teacher does and these grades should go on the report cards rather than have the teacher "decide" whether they are proper or not. This would give the pre-service teacher more leverage with children and help eliminate some of the discipline problems which pre-service teachers usually have.				

	4	3	2	1
16. If a "student of teaching" is experiencing extreme difficulty in the classroom, every effort should be made to remove him/her so that the instructional program for the children does not suffer.				
17. Cooperative partnerships, involving University-School-Community, are proportionately more costly than beneficial to the school and more beneficial than costly to the university because the bulk of the supervision is provided by school personnel and tuition is paid to the university.				
18. The university educator's primary responsibility should be to the university student rather than to the teaching staff or the children at the site.				
19. Field-based cooperative programs between University-School-Community are too costly to operate, except when supervision can be provided by the university on a circuit-riding basis.				
20. Children should have a voice, at least an informal one, in assessing the strengths and needs of the "students of teaching" who are functioning in their classrooms.				
21. College or university faculty because of their knowledge and understanding of the theory and research underlying effective teaching should have major responsibility for designing the instructional program for pre-service teachers.				
22. The university educator belongs in the schools as this experience provides him with an opportunity to revisit the "real world" and to test various theoretical ideas.				
23. Student teachers should be limited in the decisions they make, such as grading children or communicating with parent, because of the problems they could create.				
24. Methods courses of a "general" nature which are taught on campus in isolation from the classroom are a waste of time. All methods courses should be coordinated closely with what is happening in the particular school where the trainee is assigned. These courses should also have input from cooperating teachers because they know what is <u>really</u> happening in the classroom with the children.				

Scoring Directions:

1. Beside each item number below, place the numerical rating which you gave that item.

2. Total the ratings in each column and derive an average by dividing the total by 8 (the number of items in each column).

3. After averaging your scores in each area, note the highest average and check your perception of your position and beliefs with the Key.

1		2		3	
1	_____	4	_____	2	_____
3	_____	8	_____	5	_____
9	_____	11	_____	6	_____
12	_____	14	_____	7	_____
13	_____	15	_____	10	_____
20	_____	18	_____	16	_____
22	_____	19	_____	17	_____
24	_____	21	_____	23	_____
(a) Total:	_____	(a)	_____	(a)	_____
Divide (a) by 8:					
(b) Average:	_____	(b)	_____	(b)	_____

KEY

1. If your average is highest in this area, you are ready for a new role as a university-school coordinator. You are well aware of the problems and needs of both sides of the teacher education process. You have a strong sense of the great variety of role needs in the situation and the knowledge that these needs can be solved only through the complete cooperation of all of the groups and persons involved: teacher education institution, school system, community.

2. You are probably already employed by or associated with a teacher education institution. You are aware of the problems of educating teachers, but tend to be more conscious of the problems from the higher education point of view. You will probably be held in high regard by your students, but may occasionally experience some criticism from school personnel for not completely understanding their needs.

3. You could be a Board member. Your concerns and interest lie with the public schools and you will be perceptive and cautious in your negotiations with teacher education institutions. Your concern and caution could be of benefit to both pre-service teaching school personnel and children if it is used to provide clear guidelines for cooperative efforts instead of blocking all efforts at cooperation.

Bibliography

Austin, Mary C., et al. The Torch Lighters: Tomorrow's Teachers of Reading. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Clarke, S. C. T. and H. T. Coutts. "The Future of Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 22:508-16, 1971.

Haberman, Martin. "Twenty Three Reasons Universities Can't Educate Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 22:133-140, Summer, 1971

Howsam, Robert, Dean C. Corrigan, George Denemark, and Robert J. Nash. Educating a Profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Morrison, Coleman and Mary C. Austin. The Torch Lighters Revisited. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, Inc., 1977.

Olson, Paul A., James Bowman, and Larry Freeman. Education for 1984 and After. Washington, D.C.: The United States Office of Education, 1971.

Participatory Planning in Education. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1974.

Smith, B. Othanel, et al. Teachers for the Real World. Washington D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.